APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,503	03/10/2006	Jean-Yves Bitterlich	03869.105774	4152

86528   7590   05/11/2011
King & Spalding LLP
401 Congress Avenue
Suite 3200
Austin, TX 78701

EXAMINER
PHANTANA ANGKOOL, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/11/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

AustinUSPTO@kslaw.com
AustinIP@kslaw.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 April 2011</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>4-12</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>4-12.</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Applicant's Remarks filed on December 28th, 2010.

2. Claims 4-12, 14, 16, and 18 are pending in the case. Claims 4, 7, and 10 are independent claims.

3. The indication of allowable subject matter presented in the last office action (claims 14, 16, 18 – now incorporated into their respective base claims) has been withdrawn in view of the discovery of newly found art. PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A New Ground of rejection is set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by Saka, US# 7,519,910 (hereinafter Saka) in view of Maddalozzo, Jr. et al, US# 6,445,400 B1 (hereinafter Maddalozzo). As for independent claim 4:**

Saka shows a method for generating an object processing platform between an object computer and a processing computer, wherein the object computer is configure to generate a local object computer graphical user interface (GUI) displayed by the object computer, wherein the processing computer is configured to generate a local processing computer GUI displayed by the processing computer, and wherein an ad hoc screen assembly is performed by the object computer with the processing computer to couple a respective input and/or output device, the method comprising of:

- *the object computer* (local machine, see Figure 12); *initiating a generation of an assembled display* (Figure 12, see assembled display in 7: 38-40) *combining at least a portion of a display*

belonging to the object computer and at least a portion of a display belonging to the processing

compute r(remote machine, see Figure 12 and Saka in Figure 12 and column 7, lines 15-20 show

a user interface displaying a portion of a display of a local machine desktop and a remote

machine desktop), *wherein as a result of generating the assembled display, at least a portion of*

the local object computer GUI displayed by the object computer at the time of generating the

assembled display is displayed on the display belonging to the processing computer (see Figure

12, where Saka dhows the assembled display of object and processing computer). (Saka shows

the user copying files from a remote machine desktop to local machine desktop by moving the

respective icons form remote machine desktop to local machine desktop in column 7, lines 42-47.

Figure 12 shows a portion of both local and remote machine desktops at the same time. Saka

shows that file #183 Figure 12# 1066 and pdf file Figure 12# 1068 maybe copied from remote

machine desktop to local machine desktop. Saka shows the desktop of the object computer

(local) is displayed on the processing computer (remote).

- *in response to a user moving an object from the portion of the assembled display belonging to the*
  object computer to an interaction area of the portion of the assembled display belonging to the
  processing computer (Figure 12 shows the interaction area where the user can copy a file from
  one computer to another by selecting the desired file or icon, see 7:15-20 and 7: 37-42).

- *activating a local file processing function by means of a local coupling of the object to the*
  interaction area (7:37-42);

While Saka shows a*ssembled display combining at least a portion of a display belonging to the*

object computer and at least a portion of a display belonging to the processing computer, Sake does not

specifically show *automatically causing the display belonging to the processing computer to switch from*

displaying the at least portion of the local object computer GUI to displaying the local processing

computer GUI automatically generating an object processing platform. In the same field of endeavor,

Maddalozzo teaches in *automatically causing the display belonging to the processing computer to switch*

from displaying the at least portion of the local object computer GUI to displaying the local processing

computer GUI automatically generating an object processing platform in 5:17-25 and 5:32-43. In the cited

section, Maddalozzo teaches highlighting of windows based on user selection. Accordingly it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Saka to incorporate the teaching of highlighting window border based on user input as taught by Maddalozzo, thus allowing the user to easily place focus on multiple windows displayed on a desktop (Maddalozzo, 5:32-45)

As for dependent claim 5:

Saka shows *the method according to claim 4, further, comprising an application-specific processing of the object is started by a further coupling of the object to an application icon on the display belonging to the processing computer* (7: 37-47)

As for dependent claim 6:

Saka shows *the method according to claim 5, wherein object-computer-specific data of the object is converted into application-specific data* (7:37-47 and 7:53-64)

As for independent claim 7:

Claim 7 contains similar substantial subject matter as claimed in independent claim 4, and is respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claims 8 and 9:

Claims 8 and 9 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for independent claim 10:

Claim 10 contains similar substantial subject matter as claimed in independent claim 4, and is respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As for dependent claims 11 and 12:

Claims 11 and 12 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Phantana-angkool whose telephone number is 571-272-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DP
/David Phantana-angkool/
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

                                                                /William L. Bashore/
                                                                Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175